

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

FREDERIC GREEN,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MICHAEL MINEV, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:19-cv-01889-GMN-BNW

ORDER

Plaintiff Frederic Green (“Plaintiff”), a prisoner at High Desert State Prison, moves for injunctive relief, claiming he has suffered substantial harm following inguinal ligament repair surgery. (Mot. Prelim. Inj. at 3, ECF No. 1-2). Specifically, Plaintiff complains of pain in his right testis, as well as extensive swelling, mass hematoma, discomfort, and disfigurement. (*Id.*). Plaintiff states that since his March 5, 2019 surgery, Plaintiff has had to “lift and shift his genitals for comfort while walking, rubbing against his inner thighs; attempting to sit by lifting genitals and forced to sit on the edge of seat; to bend over lifting, or spreading his legs; and forced to sleep on his back shifting for comfort and laying on his left side, along with [sporadic] nerve tingling.” (*Id.*). Plaintiff further states that, “the scrotum does not function normally, it remains a solid mass on the right testis, pulling at the inguinal [ligaments].” (*Id.*). Plaintiff contends that medical providers at High Desert State Prison have delayed and denied the treatment of Plaintiff’s inguinal ligament and testicles. (Green Decl. ¶ 21, ECF No. 1-2).

On January 3, 2020, Plaintiff filed Correspondence, (ECF No. 3), indicating that an ultrasound technician examined his scrotum on November 8, 2019, but that “Plaintiff was not educated about the results[.]” (Correspondence at 3, ECF No. 3). Plaintiff further indicates that he was examined by Dr. Schroer on December 19, 2019. (*Id.*). “Dr. Schroer recognized that Plaintiff[’s] injuries were serious, i.e. right testicle [e]ngulfed in a large mass (1) scrotum 3”

1 dia[eter] of skin peeling-scaley [sic], sensitive to touch; Plaintiff had mention [sic] the nerve
2 tingles upon the spermatic cord. At this point of the examination, Dr. Schroer stated Plaintiff
3 needs to see the urologist.” (*Id.*). Plaintiff explains that he is “unaware if an appointment with
4 the urologist will take place,” and that he believes that “the delays, denials to properly treat his
5 injuries will cause permanent damage[.]” (*Id.* at 4).

6 The seriousness of Plaintiff’s medical condition warrants an expedited response to the
7 Motion for Preliminary Injunction and the issues described above.

8 Accordingly,

9 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Attorney General’s Office shall have until
10 January 31, 2020, to advise the Court whether it will enter a limited notice of appearance on
11 behalf of Defendants only for the purposes of responding to the Motion for Preliminary
12 Injunction. Additionally, based on the serious nature of the allegations, Defendants shall have
13 until January 31, 2020, to file a response to the Motion for Preliminary Injunction. In addition
14 to addressing the merits of Plaintiff’s Motion, the response must specify whether Plaintiff has
15 been approved to see a urologist; whether a urologist appointment has been scheduled; the date
16 of any such appointment; and if no appointment has been scheduled, the reasons why no
17 appointment has been made.

18 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that if Plaintiff chooses to file a reply, he shall do so
19 within seven (7) days after Defendants file a response.

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court shall electronically serve copies of this Order; Plaintiff's Complaint, (ECF No. 1-1); Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction, (ECF No. 1-2); and Plaintiff's Correspondence, (ECF No. 3), on the Office of the Attorney General of the State of Nevada by adding the Attorney General of the State of Nevada to the docket sheet. This does not indicate acceptance of service for any Defendant.

DATED this 10 day of January, 2020.

Gloria M. Navarro, District Judge
United States District Court